

## Table of Contents

What is PART .....	
What is a “Program?” .....	
What is the Standard for Yes .....	
General Readability .....	
Adjusting Weight in a Section .....	
Rating of PART .....	
Results Not Demonstrated .....	
Sections of PART	
Program Purpose and Design .....	
Strategic Planning .....	
Program Management .....	
Program Results/Accountability .....	
PART Instrument Linkages .....	
Performance Measures .....	
Budget Data .....	
Data Book .....	

## **What is the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?**

PART is OMB's method for gauging program effectiveness, focusing management improvements, and linking performance to budget requests.

The PART was developed to assess and improve program performance to achieve better results. A PART review helps identify a program's strengths and weaknesses to inform funding and management decisions aimed at making the program more effective. The PART therefore looks at all factors that affect and reflect program performance including program purpose and design; performance measurement, evaluations, and strategic planning; program management; and program results. Because the PART includes a consistent series of analytical questions, it allows programs to show improvements over time, and allows comparisons between similar programs.

The PART also extends the usefulness of performance information by defining programs that comprise activities about which management and budget decisions are made. As a matter of sound manage practice, agencies will integrate operational decisions with strategic and performance planning by:

- improving performance measures over time through the PART review,
- aligning budgets with programs, and
- aligning programs and measures with GPRA goals.

## **What is a “program?”**

A program is an activity or set of activities intended to help achieve a particular outcome for the public. A program would generally be recognized by OMB and the Congress when making budget or other decisions. When defining programs for the purpose of completing a PART, it may be particularly important to ensure that programs comprised of multiple activities share common performance goals and are managed as one entity. Because the nature of programs vary, Treasury and OMB have a great deal of flexibility in defining what a program is for a PART review.

## **What is the standard for “yes”**

The program should show it is achieving its purpose and that it is well managed. Provide evidence and background material that justifies your answer.

## **General Readability**

Below is a summary of key guidelines:

- Provide evidence of the judgment used in determining the answer instead of just citing reports, legislation, or regulations in the evidence sections. Explanation should link to the evidence, meaning together they should include context and describe the relevant components of the cited documents that support the question response.
- Present specific programmatic details and outcomes that help clarify responses given, rather than using generalities (more, less, good, etc.).
- State the full title at least the first time an acronym is used and be careful not to over-use acronyms.

- Use the program name or Agency name instead of "we" and "us".
- In the Measures tab:
  - Specify units. For example, when a measure is "percent of X" the target should be "50" or "50%" instead of "0.5".
  - Do not put "FY" in front of year.
  - Present the measure in as plain English as possible with unit specified. For example, "Percentage of program participants ..."
  - For measures that are more technical in nature, provide an explanation of the measures in plain English and/or provide an explanation of why the measure is useful or important in the program context, as appropriate.
  - Include some historical data and baseline information to substantiate answers to 4.1 and 4.2.

## **Adjusting weight in a section**

Individual questions within a section are assigned equal weighting but the weights may be changed to most accurately portray the key factors of the program.

As a default, individual questions within a section are assigned equal weighting that total 100 percent for each section. However, the user may alter the question weighting to emphasize key factors of the program. To avoid manipulation of the total score, weights must be adjusted prior to responding to any questions. If a question is not relevant to the program, the user may rate it as Not Applicable. In these cases, the user would assign a weight of zero to the question but must provide an explanation of this response.

## **Rating of PART**

Appropriate long-term measures and targets lay the groundwork both for annual measures and targets and for assessing program results relative to those targets. Because of the strong focus on strategic planning and performance measurement, certain questions in Sections II (Strategic Planning) and IV (Results) are linked. A program cannot get full credit for meeting performance targets in Section IV, if relevant questions in Section II indicate that the long-term or annual targets are not sound. Section IV scoring allows for partial achievement of performance goals (i.e., *Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, and No*).

## **Results Not Demonstrated (RND)**

A rating of RND means that a program does not have sufficient performance measurement or performance information to show results, and therefore it is not possible to assess whether it has achieved its goals. RND is not on the same scale as the ratings "Ineffective", "Adequate", "Moderately Effective", or "Effective", each of which indicates there is evidence of a certain level of program performance. Because the PART employs an evidence-based analysis, the PART's first goal is to help ensure that Federal programs have a basis on which to assess their effectiveness, to the extent that the collection of data and impact information are feasible and cost effective. Therefore, moving programs out of an RND rating is a high priority

A program that has not been able to establish long-term and short-term performance measures or does not have data to indicate how it has been performing under measures that have been established will receive a rating of Results Not Demonstrated.

Answer		Receive Rating
Question 2.1 No		Results Not Demonstrated
Question 2.1 Yes	Question 4.1 No & Question 4.2 No	
Question 2.3 No		
Question 2.3 Yes	Question 4.1 No & Question 4.2 No	

Results Not Demonstrated does not always apply if you receive a “NO” due to failure to meet its goals, as opposed to the question not having data on its performance measures.

## **Program Purpose and Design**

Section 1 has five questions and assesses whether the program's purpose and design are clear and sound. The questions look at factors that the program, Treasury or the Administration may not directly control but have an influence such as legislation. A clear understanding of the program is necessary to setting goals, performance measures, and targets; maintaining focus; and managing the program.

Source documents, background material, and evidence for answering these questions include authorizing legislation, strategic plans, annual performance plans, and other internal reports.

Answer questions Yes, No, or Not Applicable. Programs that have design flaws in the legislation should be considered and have supporting evidence and should be noted by a No. Not Applicable should be very rare, especially for questions 1.1-1.4 because they should apply to all programs.

## **Helpful Hints**

THINK BIG! What is your enrolling legislation and key regulations? Why do you exist in the eyes of the public or Congress?

1. Assess quality of performance measures. Be sure performance measures are something that would interest the public. Performance measures should be outcome oriented and titles should be clear.
2. Have a clear time table and target that improves the program. Should have efficiency measures included in a range of goals. Performance measures should have targets established that show a progression and accomplishment of program. If target is maintained at the same level over a period of time, an evaluation should be done whether the measure tells the story.
3. Can the measure annually show the achievements of the goals? Program should be relevant to the current mission and goals. Performance measures should have targets established that are progressive. A new target should not be established lower than the previous years actual.
4. Program does not have to have a significant budget impact to be important.
5. Be sure there is no duplication. Performance measures should not be duplicated across goals or programs (customer service and employee satisfaction which should be maintained internally.)
6. Is the program designed the correct way or is there evidence that it should be changed to a different type of program?
7. Weight the questions before answering and entering your explanations.

The following goes through each question and gives an explanation of what should be entered.

Question	Answer	Explanation	Evidence/Data
<b>1.1 Is the program purpose clear?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Clear and understandable mission	Statement of the Purpose and Supporting Objectives from enacting legislation, documentation or mission, Strategic Plan
<b>1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?</b> <i>(Linked to 2.1)</i>	Should be "Yes"	Define the interest, problem, or need that is relevant to current conditions. Why does the program exist?	Describe the interest, problem, or need that this program addresses and include documentation.  Demand/volume levels for service, outputs, etc.
<b>1.3 The program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, State, local, or private effort?</b> <i>(Linked to 2.5 &amp; 4.4)</i>	Should be "Yes"	What would happen if this program did not exist?  OMB: Answers should address all aspects of this question – Federal, State, local and private sectors. Indicate whether or not there are also similar State, local or private efforts that are redundant or duplicative of the program being assessed.	
<b>1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?</b> <i>(Linked to 2.3)</i>	Should be "Yes"	Show how the program meets its objectives and program goals.  Is the program meeting its goals with/in Budget?	Cost effectiveness studies comparing alternatives or the benefits and costs of the activity.  Competitive Sourcing Study?
<b>1.5 Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Show how resources are effectively used to provide services/benefits to intended persons.  Show how resources are used for the purpose of the program.	Documentation should show that the resources are being used to reach as many people as targeted.

## **Strategic Planning**

Section 2 has 8 questions that focus on program planning, priority setting, and resource allocation. It assesses whether the Treasury has established valid long-term and annual performance measures and target for the program.

### **Helpful Hints**

1. Does your budget align with your programs' goals to show the impact?  
Congressional budget lays out program goals that align with the Treasury Strategic plan.
2. Be sure to show that you are moving toward bettering the program even though you have met the results. Evaluations and reviews that are performed to determine that programs are maintaining or moving toward better accomplishments. Performance measures should give a picture.
3. Planning should drive the dollars and focus on evaluating programs. Show how Congressional budget is structured to drive the funding level to maintain or increase performance.
4. Weight the questions before answering and entering your explanations.

Question	Answer	Explanation	Evidence/Data
<b>2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</b>  <i>(Linked to 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 &amp; 4.1)</i> <b>RND Flag</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Treasury Strategic Plan, Bureau Strategic Plan and Budget Documents lay out all this (Exhibit 3.1).</p> <p>Provide the following: (1) sound justification for why outputs were appropriate when chosen as long-term measures; (2) adequate justification for how measures meaningfully support the purpose of the programs; and (3) when measures are being developed, the measures tab should include information on the type of measure being developed.</p> <p>Ensure that measures are independently understandable.</p>	<p>Performance measures must be listed in the Measures tab of the PART worksheet as evidence to justify a "yes" response. Output measures are only acceptable if the program can provide sound justification for not adopting outcome measures; this justification must be included in the explanation.</p> <p>In cases where a program has only one long-term outcome measure, explanations should indicate whether that measure captures the most important aspects of the program's purpose.</p>
<b>2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?</b>  <i>(Linked to 2.1)</i>	Should be "Yes"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a program received a "no" to question 2.1, it must receive a "no" response for this question.</li> <li>• Where programmatic or other factors justify having out-year targets that are lower than recent performance, those factors should be addressed in the explanation and evidence sections.</li> <li>• Indicate whether baselines have been established. Baselines are encouraged for outcome measures and required for output measures.</li> <li>• All Treasury Budget Activities have outcome and efficiency measures with targets. Reference Budget Exhibit 3.1, PAR, PRS.</li> </ul>	<p>Targets must be listed on the Measures tab as evidence for a "yes" response.</p> <p>Where appropriate, highlight baseline information on the Measures tab.</p> <p>PAR, PRS, Budget Exhibit 3.1</p>
<b>2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?</b>  <i>(Linked to 1.4 &amp; 2.1)</i> <b>RND Flag</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>This question asks if the program has a <i>limited</i> number of <i>annual</i> goals that <i>directly support the long-term goals</i> evaluated by questions 2.1 and 2.2. If 2.1 received a "no" then an explanation is necessary for how the annual performance goals contribute to long-term outcomes and purpose of the program.</p> <p>Responses should be clear on how the annual goals support the long-term purpose or outcome of the program.</p> <p>Ensure that measures are independently understandable.</p> <p>This should map to Budget Exhibit 3.1 if possible. If there are internal business plans where these objectives are laid out, cite them.</p>	<p>All programs have or are developing an efficiency measure. If adoption of an efficiency measure is not feasible, adequate justification must be provided.</p> <p>For programs that received a "no" to 2.1 but a "yes" to 2.3, provide an explanation of how the annual performance measures support the purpose of the program in absence of long-term goals, as required in the guidance.</p> <p>Budget Exhibit 3.1, Business Plans, Organizational Priorities.</p>



<p><b>2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?</b></p>	<p>Should be "Yes"</p>	<p>Are there <i>baselines and ambitious</i> targets for its <i>annual</i> performance measures listed in 2.3. If 2.3 received a "no" then this question must also receive a "no" response.</p> <p>All Treasury measures have this. Use the measures in the Budget or PAR.</p> <p>Budget Exhibit 3.1, PAR, PRS, Internal Planning</p>	<p>Include targets on the Measures tab and targets must be sufficiently ambitious. Credit will be given to programs whose actual performance was substantially greater than the out-year targets when an explanation is provided. In cases where programmatic or other factors justify having out-year targets that are lower than recent performance, those factors should be addressed in the explanation and evidence sections.</p> <p>All Treasury measures have this. Use the measures in the Budget or PAR.</p>
<p><b>2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</b></p> <p><i>(Linked to 1.3 &amp; 2.5)</i></p>	<p>Should be "Yes"</p>	<p>Explanation should include how program managers ensure that partners support the overall goals of the program and measure and report on their performance.</p> <p>Think through how the program fits in to Treasury both horizontally and vertically. Then think through the organization that touches your mission.</p>	<p>Include contracts and other documents that tie contractor performance to program goals. Also include other procedures the program uses to get partners to commit to, measure and report on performance.</p>
<p><b>2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?</b></p>	<p>Should be "Yes"</p>	<p>Describe the evaluation or the manner in which the scope, quality, and/or independence was sufficient. PART answers should provide at least <i>some</i> information on each of these aspects as well as the frequency of evaluations. For a "yes" answer, the explanation should contain a succinct statement of the reasons <i>why</i> evaluations are of sufficient scope, quality, and independence:</p> <p><i>Quality</i> – Briefly describe the nature of the evaluation, including the methodology used and why it is sufficiently rigorous to provide information on the <i>effectiveness</i> (i.e., impact on program outcomes) of the program, or of the various services or approaches employed by the program.</p> <p><i>Scope</i> – Briefly describe whether and how the evaluation assesses the program achievement of performance targets and whether the results of the evaluation can be used to improve program performance.</p>	<p>Audit Plans, Management Plans, Program Review, OIG Reports, GAO Reports</p>

		<p><i>Independence</i> – Briefly describe how the party conducting the evaluation is unbiased and has "no" conflict of interest with the program.</p> <p>For a "no" answer, the explanation should provide information about which aspects of the evaluation - scope, quality, and/or independence - are insufficient.</p>	
<b>2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Reflect effective program budgeting based on sound levels of annual and long-term performance targets and budget resources.	Provide a presentation that makes clear the impact of funding, policy, or legislative decisions on expected performance and explain why the requested performance/resource mix is appropriate. The program must have budget planning that is tied to performance or strategic planning.
<b>2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Must show how the program has acted to correct strategic planning deficiencies. This includes a review of planning efforts and corrections to eliminate deficiencies.</p> <p>Program improvements, PMA, E-gov, franchising, cost savings, faster cycle time are all forms of strategic improvement.</p>	Description of how deficiencies in the strategic planning of the program were identified and corrected, and examples of changes.
<b>2.CA1. Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?</b>	Should be "Yes"	To justify a "yes" response, explanations and evidence must demonstrate not only that the program conducts analysis but also that it <i>uses</i> the results of the analysis to manage the program and make decisions.	Must emphasize the <i>use</i> of the analysis.

<b>2.RD2. Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?</b>	Should be "Yes"	The composition of a Research and Development (R&D) program's portfolio of activities will determine whether the program will be relevant and achieve its performance goals. Since R&D program management most often cannot fund all of the proposals (or alternatives) it receives or solicits. "Yes" responses must indicate that the program has a process in place to identify priorities and subsequently uses the priorities to guide budget requests <i>and</i> funding decisions, i.e. the prioritization process must be able to help separate promising proposals (or alternatives) from less promising ones.	The process must be adequately documented and provided as evidence.
<b>2.RG1. Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Regulations that are absolutely necessary to accomplish the program mission and goals or in the process of being promulgated. Should show how the regulations fit the overall achievement of the program goals.	Legislation, regulations or internal guidance indicating a process is in place to ensure rulemaking involves a clear linkage of the rule to a goal. Clearly show the association.

## **Program Management**

Section 3 has 7 questions and focuses on elements related to whether the program is effectively managed to meet program performance goals. It rates agency management of the program, including financial oversight and program improvement efforts.

This section also contains additional questions that pertain to the program type: Competitive Grant Programs (3), Block/Formula Grant Programs (2), Regulatory Based Programs (4), Credit Programs (2), and Research and Development Programs (1).

## **Helpful Hints**

Potential source documents and evidence for answering questions in this section include financial statements, GAO reports, IG reports, performance plans, budget execution data, IT plans, independent program evaluations, and SES performance plans.

1. Decide your key measures. The measures should drive the data not the other way around. Performance measures should be outcome oriented to show the results achieved by the program.
2. Are managers being held accountable? Are they clearly identified and is it contained in their performance evaluation? SES Accountability system ensures that every program is embedded in the performance evaluations, as they relate to the Strategic plan. This should be included in the write-up provided and any other system in the bureau.
3. Is money used timely and effectively for what it was intended? Budget Execution Reports
4. Are the incentives and procedures of the program effectively and efficiently showing the execution of the program?
5. Are full costs known and being budgeted for?
6. Is there a process to track erroneous payments?
7. Are you reviewing the effectiveness of the program and taking steps on the deficiencies?
8. Do you tend to get what you measure?
9. Outputs measure things happening in systems because it does not really give you the results.
10. Output measures could be doing well on paper but not showing results in the program that they are related.
11. Do not consider performance measures that may be costly to collect because they would be unbeneficial to the program.
12. Pick performance measures that are useful to you and can be measured down the line.

13. Performance measures should give insight as to whether you need more money in the program.
14. Outcome measures should be the main focus on how the program is performing.
15. Outcome measures should determine if you are accomplishing your mission.
16. Focus on the big picture with each year's installment to achieve the goal.
17. Weight the questions before answering and entering your explanations.

Question	Answer	Explanation	Evidence/Data
<b>3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Show that the program regularly collects quality performance data relating to key program goals and is used to adjust program priorities, allocate resources, or take other management actions.  Treasury Performance Reporting System (PRS) collects quarterly. Are there similar internal checks?	Documentation of management actions based on performance information.  Evidence that shows steps taken by program to enact necessary improvements cited by evaluation.
<b>3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</b>	Should be "Yes"	The existence of a system for personnel evaluations is not sufficient; the explanation must describe how that mechanism incorporates program performance into the evaluation criteria and holds managers accountable to justify a "yes" response.  SES Evaluations do this.  Reference any internal controls, budget reports, etc.	Evidence can include a mechanism for incorporating program performance into personnel performance evaluation criteria.
<b>3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Show that funds are obligated consistently with the program plan and limited amount remain at the end of year.	Periodic and Year-end spending reports from the program. Reports include: Spending reports, Program Operating Plans, and Audit Plans.
<b>3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Management procedures that are in place to ensure the most efficient use of funds on program execution.	Efficiency measures, competitive-sourcing plans, and IT improvement plans.
<b>3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Describe <i>results</i> from collaborations. The explanation must describe these actions and results in order to justify a "yes" response.  Think about horizontal and vertical integration with Treasury, then stakeholders.	"Yes" answer requires evidence of collaboration <i>leading to meaningful actions</i> .

<b>3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Should have no material internal control weaknesses reported by auditors. If so, answer is "No."  Annual audit	Procedures in place to ensure that payments are made properly, Financial management systems meet statutory requirements, Integrated financial and performance systems, and financial statements with a clean opinion.
<b>3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Has the program developed a system of evaluating program and correcting identified deficiencies?  Inspector General findings  Documented internal controls	Documentation on how deficiencies were discovered and what corrections were made.
<b>3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Are grant funds distributed according to the competitive process?	Independent merit review and ranking of applications. Documentation of earmarked funds. Description of award process. New awardees per award cycle and technical assistance and outreach efforts.
<b>3.BF1 and 3.CO2. Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</b>	Should be "Yes"	How funds are utilized by grantees. Must indicate that relevant grantee performance, progress or activity data along with financial information is collected <i>and</i> reviewed by program management to understand how funds are utilized by grantees in order to justify a "yes" response. Programs that simply collect data on grantees but do not review them must receive a "no".	A reporting system that tracks expenditures by grantees. Reporting structure, oversight techniques, audit or site visit schedule, and/or an assessment of program data quality.
<b>3.BF2 and 3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</b>	Should be "Yes"	System in place to collect and present publicly information that capture important impacts of program performance.	Citation of types of data collected and disseminated and description of how made available. Performance information available via a web-site or widely available reports.

<b>3.RG1. Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Level of coordination during the rulemaking process.	Notices seeking public comment and addressing comments in final rules, regulations preambles. Detailed preamble language discusses how public comments were considered and addressed.
<b>3.RG2. Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act; and did those analyses comply with OMB guidelines?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Preparation of sound analyses (cost-benefit analysis, risk analysis) that are rigorous, thorough, and based upon best available data.	Regulatory impact analyses, regulatory flexibility analyses, cost-benefit analyses for the rules, any reports or feedback by outside reviewers, and coordination between reviewers and program.
<b>3.RG3. Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Met the goal intended when developing the regulation. Regulation consists only of those regulations necessary to achieve goals, relevant to current societal and economic situation, and complementary and consistent with each other.	Program plan or process to conduct this exercise on a regular basis; Assessments, evaluations, or examinations (planned or completed) as a result of plan or process; Documentation as a result of review that shows changes made or eliminated or justification if no change was made.



<b>3.RG4. Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?</b>	Should be "Yes"	While promulgating regulations do you ensure that all regulatory requirements maximize the net benefits.	Statistics on compliance reporting burden and the cost of the program requirements or a thorough cost-benefit analysis.
<b>3.CA1. Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Clearly identify and define the required quality, capability, and performance characteristics or objectives expected of end product/result of asset or service acquisition.	Program documentation of planning decision validation for asset acquisitions and documentation describing key performance characteristics and/or deliverables and show this information is used in decision-making.
<b>3.CR1. Is the program managed on an ongoing basis to assure credit quality remains sound, collections and disbursements are timely, and reporting requirements are fulfilled?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Must address all of the factors listed in the guidance to justify a "yes" response. Explanations and evidence should not only state that reviews are conducted, but also discuss whether the reviews found that operations are consistent with current policy, good credit administration practices, and agency operating guidelines. Additionally, the explanation should explicitly address actions the program is taking to reduce defaults and maximize collections and recoveries.	Quarterly financial statements, internal evaluations, external independent performance evaluations, reports from field representatives or trips to the field on the borrowers' performance.
<b>3.CR2. Do the program's credit models adequately provide reliable, consistent, accurate and transparent estimates of costs and the risk to the Government?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Reliable method for estimating program costs.	Description of problem or advantages of cost estimation model.
<b>3.RD1. For R&amp;D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?</b>	Should be "Yes"	"Yes" response requires submission of a description of the program's funding or alternative selection process that satisfies all components of the guidance criteria.	Description of awards, process, percentage of funds earmarked, percentage of funds subject to competitive peer review, and results of external assessments.

## **Program Results/Accountability**

Section 4 has 5 questions that consider whether a program is meeting its long-term and annual performance goals. It should rate program performance on performance measures and targets reviewed in the strategic planning section and through other evaluations.

This section also contains additional questions that pertain to the program type: Regulatory Based Programs (1) and Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Programs (1).

## **Helpful Hints**

1. If you are doing a good job, you will be rewarded if you can document what you are achieving. You need to tell your program success story here.
2. The linkage between having long-term goals that are performing and also having long-term performance measures. Performance measures should be established to also show incremental improvement.
3. No annual goal results to achieve annual performance goals. These goals have not established performance measures in the performance plan.
4. No goals means NO in improving efficiency and effectiveness. Also, if you are treading in the right direction, say so.
5. Has there been an independent evaluation (comprehensive) that reports on the results and effectiveness of the program?
6. Weight the questions before answering and entering your explanations.

Question	Answer	Explanation	Evidence/Data
<b>4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?</b>  <i>(Linked to 2.1 &amp; 2.2)</i>  <b>RND Flag</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Determine whether the program is meeting or making measurable progress toward meeting the long-term performance goals evaluated in Questions 2.1 and 2.2.</p> <p>Where partial credit is given, the explanation should clearly justify why a "small extent" or a "large extent" was chosen. Responses should be consistent with the information presented in the Measures tab.</p> <p>Are you moving in the right direction.</p> <p>Budget tables, PRS and Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) are all good.</p>	<p>Measures tab should include performance targets and actual data for prior years indicating that the targets were met or exceeded. Consider efficiency measures.</p> <p>If adequate outcome (or output) measures are not available and a program received a "no" in Question 2.1, the program must receive a <i>No</i> answer to this question.</p> <p>Inconsistency is where a program received a "yes" to question 2.1, but a "no" to question 2.2; then the program cannot receive a rating higher than a "small extent".</p>
<b>4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</b>  <i>(Linked to 2.3 &amp; 2.4)</i>  <b>RND Flag</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Determine whether the program is meeting or making measurable progress toward meeting the annual performance goals evaluated in Questions 2.3 and 2.4.</p> <p>Similar to question 4.1, when a program received a "yes" to question 2.3, but a "no" to question 2.4. In these instances, the program cannot receive a rating higher than a "small extent".</p> <p>Where partial credit is given, the explanation should clearly justify why a "small extent" or a "large extent" was chosen.</p> <p>Make sure you draw the distinction between annual targets and stretch goals.</p>	<p>The program has met <i>all</i> of its annual targets.</p> <p>Responses should be consistent with the information presented in the Measures tab. Consider efficiency measures.</p> <p>If program received a "no" in Question 2.3, the program must receive a <i>No</i> answer to this question.</p> <p>Inconsistency is where a program received a "yes" to question 2.3, but a "no" to question 2.4; then the program cannot receive a rating higher than a "small extent".</p>
<b>4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Show how management practices have resulted in efficiency gains.</p> <p>Efficiency measures established for budget activities.</p>	<p>Met performance targets to reduce per unit cost or time, met production and schedule targets, met other targets that resulted in tangible productivity or efficiency gains.</p>

<b>4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?</b>  <b>(Linked to 1.3)</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Compare the program's performance to that of other programs that have a <i>similar</i> (though not necessarily identical) purpose. "Not applicable" (NA) is an appropriate response if there are no federal, state, local government, or private sector programs with similar <i>purpose or goal</i> or if completing the comparison would be unreasonably difficult or costly.</p> <p>This question is not linked to question 1.3. Programs can have a comparable purpose even if they serve different populations or provide services in different fashions.</p> <p>The explanation can justify an NA because it summarizes the purpose of the program, highlights programs that might be considered comparable, and explains why they are not.</p>	Evaluations and documents comparing similar programs.
<b>4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</b>	Should be "Yes"	<p>Is program effective based on independent and comprehensive evaluations?</p> <p>Peer reviews?</p> <p>Financial audits (these include a review of the performance measures)</p> <p>Competitive sourcing</p>	Audit Plans, Management Plans, Program Review, OIG Reports, GAO Reports, Academic and research institutions, agency contracts, or other independent entities.
<b>4.RG1. Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Whether program met its goals in the most efficient way possible.	Regulatory Impact Analyses or other supporting programmatic analyses, look-back studies, independent evaluations or additional impact analyses using retrospective data.
<b>4.CA1. Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?</b>	Should be "Yes"	Whether valid program goals were achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules. Also whether program spends funds as planned and budgeted.	Comparison of contract schedule, deliverables, and costs with the final outcome.

## PART Instrument Linkages

Required PART Question Linkages						
	Q2.2	Q2.3	Q2.4	Q2.5	Q4.1	Q4.2
If Q2.1="no"	Must answer "no"	Must provide explanation of how annual performance goals contribute to long-term outcomes and purpose to receive a "yes"		Must answer "no" if both Q2.1="no" and Q2.3="no"	Must answer "no" if adequate outcome (or output) measures are not available	
If Q2.3="no"			Must answer "no"			Must answer "no"
If Q2.1="yes" and Q2.2="no"					No higher than "small extent"	
If Q2.3="yes" and Q2.4="no"						No higher than "small extent"

## **Performance Measures**

Performance measures should be established to determine and assess program effectiveness. In establishing the performance measures you must make sure that you are measuring the right things. The performance measures should reflect the program priorities which mean they should be few in number. The performance measures should be outcome oriented unless it is more appropriate to establish output measures. Outcome performance measures are preferred because they show a result for the public. There has to be an agreement between the bureau, headquarters and OMB for the performance measures to be established.

### Streamlining Exercise Established

- Efficiency and outcome measures for most budget activities
- Measures were streamlined to report on key measures
- Performance goals are being reviewed for outcome orientation
- Review of tie-in to Treasury goals

### Results and Measures

- Treasury is pro results and pro good performance measures
- Based on Congressional calls to limit performance information, economizing number of measures
- Review targets established for gains and improvements

The following define the terms used:

- Strategic goals – statement of aim or purpose included in a strategic plan. In the performance budget/performance plan, should be used to group multiple program outcome goals
- Performance goals – sets a target level of performance overtime expressed as a tangible, measurable objective
  - Annual –measures and targets due to activity undertaken for a particular near-term year
  - Long-term - measures and targets due to activity undertaken for a goal in the future
- Performance measures – indicators, statistics or metrics used to gauge program performance.
  - Outcome – describes the intended result that will occur from carrying out the program or activity
  - Output – describes the level of activity that will be provided over a period of time, including a description of the characteristics (timeliness) established as standards for the activity
  - Efficiency – the ratio of the outcome or output to the input of any program
- Targets – quantifiable or otherwise measurable characteristics that tell hw well a program must accomplish a performance measure
- Baseline – starting point from which gains are measured and targets are set

## **Budget Data**

The levels entered should be in terms that are meaningful to the program. The worksheet can collect the obligations and budget activity for each account that funds the program.

- There is a worksheet labeled “Account Info” for entry of budget account information and funding levels.
- On the “program funding level” row, enter the total resources available to the program for the prior year and current year.
- Budget year estimates should be left blank for now.

The PART assessments are conducted every year on a subset of agency programs prior to agency submission of its performance budget to OMB. Subsequently, OMB will use the current and past years' PART assessments to help make decisions as the President's Budget is formulated. The performance targets included in the PARTs and congressional justifications will need to be updated to reflect the budgetary resources and associated performance targets decided for the President's Budget.

For each strategic goal, there are usually several outcome goals, and for each outcome goal, there typically are several output goals. The outcome and output goals for programs are the performance measures and targets validated through the PART process and included in the performance budget.

A performance budget starts from an overview of what the agency intends to accomplish in the budget year, structured by the goals in the agency's strategic plan. For each strategic goal, the overview would provide background on what has been accomplished, analyses of the strategies the agency uses to influence outcomes and how they could be improved, analyses of the programs that contribute to that goal, including their relative roles and effectiveness, using Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessments when available. The overview should include expected outcomes for each strategic goal, and performance targets for the supporting programs. It should summarize how the agency expects to manage the "portfolio" of programs for each strategic goal together to maximize the larger strategic outcome.

## **Data Book**

A book should be compiled with all the evidence, background material, documentation, regulations, etc., that was stated in the worksheet.

To make it easy for the reviewer, the material should be tabbed and labeled to correspond with PART section and question.